

<https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJLCL/2026/6.2.8291>

Posthumanism in Contemporary Philosophy: Key Debates and Criticisms

Kato Nabirye H.

Faculty of Business, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the major debates, conceptual foundations, and criticisms of posthumanism in contemporary philosophy. It argues that posthumanism is best understood not as a singular doctrine but as a family of approaches that challenge anthropocentrism and reconsider the ethical, ontological, and epistemological privileges traditionally accorded to “the human.” The discussion traces posthumanism’s intellectual lineages through phenomenology, critical theory, feminist thought, science and technology studies, and post-structuralism, while distinguishing it from transhumanism’s enhancement-oriented agenda. Core themes include the expansion of moral consideration beyond humans, distributed and relational accounts of agency, critiques of human exceptionalism, and the implications of artificial intelligence, environmental crisis, and biotechnological transformation for contemporary understandings of subjectivity and responsibility. The paper also surveys major currents in continental, analytic, feminist, queer, and critical race philosophy, highlighting how posthumanist thought intersects with questions of embodiment, power, governance, and ecological entanglement. At the same time, it evaluates significant criticisms: conceptual vagueness, risks of re-centering the human under the banner of the “posthuman,” methodological indeterminacy, and insufficient attention to political economy, justice, and regulation. The analysis concludes that posthumanism’s enduring contribution lies less in announcing a future beyond humanity than in providing tools for analyzing present configurations of human–nonhuman relations, technological mediation, and planetary interdependence.

Keywords: Post-humanism, Anthropocentrism, Distributed agency, Artificial intelligence and Environmental humanities.

INTRODUCTION

Posthumanism impeaches anthropocentrism and advocates the consideration of nonhuman entities and agency in its ethical, ontological, and epistemological inquiry [1]. Its emergence represents a conjunction of scientific discovery, technological advancement, political reconfiguration, environmental threat, and cultural introspection [1]. The roots of posthumanism extend into the twentieth century, growing from phenomenology and existentialism to critical theory, feminist theory, science and technology studies, deconstruction, and post-structuralism, yet it remains firmly modern and contemporary in orientation [2]. The proliferation of positionalities and the turn to a wide variety of materials and actors place contemporary scholarship at a crossroads. It is possible to propose a fundamental level of agreement upon a set of problematics to animate inquiries [2].

Conceptual Foundations of Posthumanism

The emergence of new questions at the intersection of human and nonhuman is duly noted by contemporary posthumanism [1]. The notion of overcrowding suggests a different generational turning that has led to urgent, unprecedented inquiries into other-than-human environments and the materials and entities from which they are formed. The belief that humanity is overexposed perhaps even overvalued, while still seeking immunity from

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

international terrorism, informs current trends toward boundary-dissolving porousness [1]. Increasing reluctance continues to acknowledge humanness as the privileged provincial inception to theorize thinking otherwise, let alone otherthinking and its wider ecological entanglement within still-thoughtable and thinkable worlds. Formulating inquiry in terms of posthumanism rather than refusing, retreating, or turning back already exhibits the inadequacy of thinking human-centeredness as post-human is beginning to be illustrated well outside philosophy [2]. Posthumanist configuration emphasizes post-anthropocentric reluctance toward yet another no longer adequate definition of “human [3].” Theoretical posthumanism responds to rather than otherwise seeks only to outperform french theorists whose thought has been termed posthumanist, often through the nomenclature post-structuralism. Another response concerns literary considerations of still-thoughtable languages that nevertheless exist neither about nor contain nor are divided within human being [4]. Thinking that remains “children of the obsolete” nevertheless questions entry into even hand-holding appropriations of french so-called post-humanism and, beneath it, contemporary english-language consideration of other-than-human. It also invites literature, left open here, and exercise language beyond even posthuman/post-anthropocentres community, literature in which the freedom of thinking far exceeds and ordinarily waits elsewhere still and yet also thinks otherwise [3].

Defining Posthumanism

Posthumanism embraces multiple perspectives, with disparate foundations and ends. At its broadest, it encompasses a wide swath of discourses that assume the priority of the nonhuman, explicitly contesting human exceptionalism and the exclusive attribution of “human” status to certain beings or systems [5]. Within philosophy, the posthumanist critique centers on three interrelated domains: ethics, ontology, and epistemology. From an ethical standpoint, posthumanism undertakes to widen the scope of moral consideration beyond the human, interrogating the basis for rights and duties extended to nonhuman beings, systems, and entities [6]. In ontological terms, posthumanism seeks to reconceive the nature of agency and subjectivity, distinguishing between various kinds of beings and the diverse states of being they may inhabit at any given time [7]. Epistemologically, posthumanism examines the methodologies, criteria of justification, and overarching frameworks of knowledge production scientific, philosophical, and beyond testing their applicability when the human-centric perspective is not presupposed [3].

Historical Antecedents and Intellectual Lineages

The term posthumanism appears numerous times over the course of the twentieth century and cuts across a range of disciplines (philosophy, art, science, literature, sociology, anthropology [1]. However, the period of full articulation of the issues it raises is roughly contemporary with the rise of cybernetics and the USA-URSS rivalry on one hand and, on the other hand, with the processual turn in the sciences and the disclosure of the ecocritical dimension of the human [2]. “Disclosure” also appeared around 1980 thanks to Martin Heidegger’s appropriation of the notions of being and the world towards the disclosure of the human and the revealment of the other and the unrevealable. This brief reélaboration of the history of philosophical thought in the twentieth century brings to the surface that the debates on posthumanism are inextricably intertwined with the anthropological question [3]. The philosophical tradition considered under the umbrella of posthumanism (at least some segments of it) draws from the phenomenological tradition starting from the early works of Edmund Husserl beginning in 1900 and from the approximately coeval reflections on the human body; and from the German tradition of critical theory (which constitutes the philosophical counterpart to the American pragmatist tradition) [4]. Difference is therefore a key precept and therefore posthumanism dispose of epistemological projection without the pole of any previous coordination of the human [5].

Core Arguments in Posthumanist Discourse

Posthumanism: a Fickle Philosophy?[6]The decisive feature of posthumanism is a tacit decentering of the human from privileged positions once assumed by classical theology and philosophy. This decentering has been many times invoked throughout history most notably, by the Copernican Revolution, Darwinian theory, and Freudian psychology resulting in the reconfiguration of the distribution of agency among animate agents[7]. The twenty-first century, contemporary, posthumanism marks yet another attempt to delineate a framework to emerge from the set of implications engendered by various forms, repeatedly, and in explicitly and implicitly, technological and other socio-political considerations affecting humans, nonhuman animals, and inanimate actors, proposing multiplicity and its attendant conditions as the principle guiding the exposition of posthumanism[8]. However, consideration has also been devoted to the relation of posthumanism to the parent movement of transhumanism [1]. Transhumanism broadly champions the enhancement of the human imperative through advanced technological means whereas posthumanism offers an explicit rejection of the human-centred framework in favour of the examination of the universe of technicians and agents that operate, sometimes with, sometimes without, resort to invocations of human intentionality[2]. Transhumanism is exclusively concerned with realms of

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

ontologically-humans rather than the expanded domain of posthumans. Polysemic terms such as 'study', 'human', 'ology', and 'actor' are deployed for purposes of wider outreach throughout philosophy, applied and concrete science, technology, mathematics, religion, and art[3]. Contemporary posthumanism operates within the strictures established by the prior movement of modernism, within which the disproportionate weight of agency attributed to and the priority of humanity over the world and acting nonhuman other agents are tackled[4]. Posthuman instruments and other paradigms, inclusive of human visualisation devices, manipulate the notion of agency to various ends. The consequent sociology of the posthuman supplemented by individual theorists and policies, which sometimes straddle the border of commentary proposes that any single, stable definition of the posthuman is highly improbable [5]. Extension remains the operative approach. Through agency-inducing linguistic tools, cutting or enabling information transformations extend over the living, dead, animated, or otherwise designated [6].

Ethics and the Expansion of Moral Consideration

Being human is often equated with a certain intellectual prowess. However, the mere possession of an intellect and the attribution of reason to it does not suffice to acquire the status of a moral agent and the corresponding right to respect [7]. The same applies to the capacity for language. People are born without language, and even when spoken, words do not automatically signify agents that deserve moral consideration [8]. The capacity for having a moral sense and the necessity of being civilized are required for an individual to be perceived as a moral agent. For instance, an individual replete with self-consciousness prior to acquiring language does not possess a moral status [4]. Whatever moral regard may be attributed to the person next door, that regard is further extended to other animals. Ethics may now be applied to animals [9]. The applicability of ethics to anything non-human or non-individual remains an open question, however [5].

Ontology and the Question of Agency

In posthumanist accounts, ontology serves as an entry point into questions of agency. In a widely cited formulation, Graham Harman observes that, throughout the twentieth century, human intentionality served as a criterion for existence: the nonhuman world counted as real only if it was thought, grasped, or represented by human minds [6]. By such ontological measures, posthuman agency remains the centre of gravity among both ethical and epistemic questions. An account of "distributed" agency decouples phenomena, animals, machines, environments, from any particular connotation of "human [7]." Extending from William James through Alfred North Whitehead to contemporary process thinkers, such reconceptions of causality embrace trans- scending and temporal aspects in the articulation of act [8]. Agency is detached both from the individual hypothesis and from human species. An agent is any entity capable of producing a change or stabilisation in the world. Instead of reflexively positioning humans at the origin of events, posthumanist practical and theoretical approaches highlight that mediation occurs through any agential multitude of complex interactions [9].

Epistemology and the Boundaries of Knowledge

Interrogating knowledge entails evaluating the criteria and grounds for its justification [10]. A central tenet of posthumanist argumentation comprises the assertion that, owing to specific attributes attributed to humans, the criteria for knowledge, legitimacy, truth, and justification adopted by a given epistemological framework originate in a human-centered perspective [11]. Consequently, the value of this epistemic framework and the pertinence of its concepts to an organized and significant understanding of knowledges cultivated by heterogeneous, nonhuman actors are intrinsically limited [7].

Posthumanism in Contemporary Philosophical Traditions

Posthumanism constitutes an influential contemporary movement that interrogates the traditional association of the term "human" with unique ontological and moral status, divests philosophy of arbitrary distinctions between human and nonhuman worlds, and redresses the exclusion of nonhuman others from ethical consideration[8]. Although the term itself only came into use in the 1960s, its themes have long roots. Significant connections can be traced to strands of post-World War II critical theory, the rejection of human exceptionalism in contemporary science studies, feminist approaches to sex and gender, and the historic preoccupation of continental philosophers with "the other [9]." Posthumanism is often associated with a variety of eschatological speculations about the future evolution of the human species or the imminent emergence of a posthuman super-intelligence. Such notions are alien to nearly all posthumanist thought, which rejects the fixation on an epochal "before" and "after," resists an understanding of "post-" as "beyond" or "trans," and privileges considerations of contemporary ethical, political, and ontological issues of urgent import [1]. Rather than total liberation from the human or the development of a transcendent intelligence, the focus lies on the current articulation of the human alongside the continuing proliferation of humanity's others. Posthumanism invites elaboration of a "post-humanism" situated entirely within the present, without a turn toward the future. Continental, Analytic, Feminist, Queer, and Critical Race philosophy cultivate significant posthumanist currents [10]. Continental philosophy offers a wide range of avenues to pursue

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

the critical and speculative elaboration of multiple non-humans others alongside the human that constitute a posthumanism of the present [11]. The rejection of human exceptionalism resonates powerfully with feminist, queer, and critical race thought, which examines the power relations and forms of subjectivity that undergird the attribution of moral status and the allocation of rights, privileges, and resources to various entities, including not only humans but also artificial intelligences, animals, ecological processes, and territories [3].

Continental Perspectives

There are multiple philosophical movements identified under the name of posthumanism. Despite their divergences, all varieties of posthumanism share the aim of decoupling human being from the definition of the person [12]. Whether through the rediscovery of the animality of the human, the extension of the criteria of personhood to machines, or the insistence on the decentering of the human in nonhuman ontologies, all these posthumanisms challenge humanism and its conception of humanism via a reconsideration of the concept of the human itself [13]. The connection between the human and the person has been the focus of many of the discussions started earlier, even before they were labelled posthumanism [1]. An examination of the key texts associated with these distinct positions as well as their trajectory will make it possible to grasp what connects them, how they fit into the posthumanism debate, and what could be found interesting in them today. Posthumanist thought has a long lineage that can be traced back to the work of Edmund Husserl, Theodor W. Adorno, Simone de Beauvoir, Michel Foucault, Bruno Latour, and Jacques Derrida. Although some attempts have been made in recent years to bring back these thinkers into the posthumanism debate, they remain largely absent from debates about posthumanism in the contemporary and critical sense of the term [14].

Analytic Approaches

Using acceptance criteria for mind in the context of hybrid systems, it becomes possible to articulate criteria for complex systems that admit both human and nonhuman contributions to agency [12]. Such a transdisciplinary approach to agency beyond humanism, now pursued by multiple groups within and beyond the humanities remains open to various kinds of participation in the posthuman [13]. Recognition that there can exist long-lived entities without the kind of bounded agency conventionally associated with the term “agent” underwrites this wider notion. However, such Loids go beyond mere inanimate operation, since their states, and their attendant variations are inextricably dependent on interactive engagements with and modifications by the world; the same applies to continually inoperative systems [8, 14].

Feminist, Queer, and Critical Race Readings

Feminist, Queer, and Critical Race readings perceive posthumanism as inherently social [8]. These approaches interrogate embodiment, subjectivity, and power through the lenses of gender, sexuality, and race. Related discussions encompass politicized theorizations of monstrosity, and scrutiny of Paul B. Preciado's pharmacopornographic regime positioned as a “posthumanist anarchism” [9]. Scientists and technoscientists, when deemed excluded or excessive to scientific criteria, become “catastrophic subjects” liable to catastrophic judgments, resisting practices normalized by dominant power. Judith Halberstam explores contemporary Gothic horror, tracing a queer monstrosity that selects its subjects and forecloses choice and cosmetic technobiopolitics as a regime inscribing normative conditions on bodies and their futures [8]. The monstrous feminine refers to a feminine that disturbs the cultural equation of woman and the human: displacement transfers monstrosity from women to their characters, the projection to the locus of desire and aesthetic exercise [9]. Additionally, feminist engagement with Haraway elucidates undergoing an ethical transformation concomitant to posthumanist biotechnological alteration [10, 11]. Identity formation engages both non-identity and an in-between stratum overlapping desire and body, wherein desire shapes bodies preestablished as universalized gendered units. Such frameworks are analyzed from an ethical standpoint regarding their efficacy in productively resisting the apparatus that supplies continued identity [12, 13].

Key Debates within Posthumanism

Contemporary posthumanism emerges as a variant of materialism striving to disentangle the interlocking fates of humans and nonhumans [8]. Tracing its intellectual lineage to the phenomenological turn of the twentieth century, it proposes a reconfiguration of agency that distributes rather than eliminates human responsibilities. Since the mid-2000s, such propositions have provoked a lively debate within the philosophical community [9]. The contours of these discussions are shaped by skepticism about the transformative impact of technology on subjectivity, the ethics of porous boundaries governing encounters between human and nonhuman actors, and articulations of ontology of life that remains faithful to the vitality of material systems [10, 1, 3]. Debates about the human remain tightly interwoven with questions concerning the status of technology, particularly the implications of artificial intelligence (AI) for agency, autonomy, responsibility, governance, and risk. A related line of inquiry concerns the conditions for conferring political standing on nonhumans, examining whether posthumanism grants immunity from the centralizing forces of human exceptionalism [11]. Whereas a

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

deployment of posthumanism concentrated on the cultural sphere has tended to endorse the decentering of the human subject, posthumanism articulated within the sciences has sought to inscribe life in nonhuman terms [12].

Human Exceptionalism vs. Posthuman Immunity

Human exceptionalism, or the attitude and belief “that human occupy a superior position with regards to the rest of the living world,” shapes both ethical and political theory [8] and leads to boundaries that separate humans from nonhumans [2]. Even posthumanists or antihumanists who attempt to dismiss or displace the human point of view seem reluctant to cede the powerful human privilege that grants moral standing to apply their critique [3]. The concept of posthuman immunity attempts to articulate the ethical-challenging crux of the posthuman notion to preserve the linkage and examination of multiple realities [4]. Understanding how and why ontological badly formed criteria restrict posthuman thinking will determine whether a useful trace of the concept can remain within the political [3].

The Role of Technology and Artificial Intelligence

Posthumanism emerges from, and offers a radical critique of, humanism an intellectual and political movement that symbolizes humanity’s quest for knowledge and denounces extrahuman and nonhuman conditions within the “grand narrative” of definitive knowledge [3]. Despite posthumanism’s conspicuous contemporary character and symptoms of exhaustion, substantial momentum persists within ruminations on the human condition, especially transdisciplinary reflections on science and its transformational allies [4]. Humanism aspires to lucid awareness and understanding of other beings (“others” both human and nonhuman); and human emancipation from servile dependence on extrahuman and nonhuman conditions [11]. Assertions of humanity’s obligation to maintain or enhance the character of the human when broadly interpreted, whether by reforming seats of government (political humanism), enlarging agencies capable of human comprehension (scientific humanism), acquiring immortal machines, or perturbing corporeal form, invariably reject claims of irrelevance or inapplicability [12]. Extractions from humanist rhetoric unite as “posthuman materialism”, a capacious construct that proposes to address, reverse, and critique its formative parental proscriptions [13]. The advent of contemporary computer-based information systems engendered a state of posthumanism at variance with the historical tendency to construe existence amid human-centered codes of ambitions and aspirations [14]. Mirroring the advent of complex electro-mechanical analogue control machines at the turn of the twentieth century, so too do digital, hybrid, and microbial information systems necessitate speculation regarding life both inclusive and beyond human confines [11]. As a consequence, prior ruminations on the prospect and character of the transhuman, a consequence of the digital turn within the cultural-historical spectrum, re-emerge [4]. The perennial philosophical talk regarding the possibility and the ramifications of (trans) humanism is amplified by discussions around artificial intelligence (AI) and robotics [12]. The progress of science raises some existential questions about intelligibility, agency, autonomy, control, responsibility, and what is proper governance in this domain [13]. Society now possesses some systems capable of fully automated decision making and complex self-learning by dissecting and also modifying, signals coming from human feeds (on the Web and elsewhere) [14]. Reasoning is important, and reasoning machine decisions challenge tradition and institutional designs. Various efforts with both interests and fears address commitments towards prospects arising from technology implementation [1]. The aim is to preserve and instigate possibilities for healthy, lively, and fair contemporary coexistence while addressing artificial systems, algorithms, and AI machinery as relevant agents within posthumanism [2].

Materialism, Vitalism, and Ecocritical Dates

Materialism, vitalism, and ecocritical debates within posthumanism explore ontological questions concerning modes of existence Hertz and Keller argue that a materialist posthumanism should resonate with the political aspirations of antihumanism, particularly in the face of neoliberalism’s commodification of life [13]. Materialist perspectives emphasize the entanglement of humans and nonhumans and the mutual co-constitution of social and material worlds [14]. The posthumanist conceptualization of life differs significantly from vitalism, whether in the writings of Henri Bergson, Baruch Spinoza, Gilbert Simondon, or, more recently, Matthew H. J. McKeon. Hertz and Keller argue that, unlike vitalism, materialist posthumanism has recognized the accelerating anthropogenic destruction of vital processes and is able to grasp both the existence of life on Earth and the multiple processes through which life operates [1, 5]. Materialist posthumanism still conceives of life as yet to emerge and of existence as allowing for the continued amortization of life [6]. Hertz and Keller’s aim is to demonstrate that posthumanism applies equally to humans, antithetical to humanism’s preoccupation with independence and prefigured states of subjectivity with the acknowledgement that living processes embrace a wider array of entities than are conventionally attributed [13]. The persistence of living processes on Earth and the age of the planet are formative concerns of materialist posthumanism [14].

Ethics of Porosity: Boundaries between Human and Nonhuman

The transition from individualism towards posthumanism highlights a consideration of human-nonhuman interactions based on mutuality, rather than one-sidedness [11]. Exclusion of nonhumans from ethical concern, even with humanism's commitment to diversity, subsumes nonhumans under human service, absent constraints on what constitutes ethical object [12]. Describing a horizon of hospitality towards newcomer's calls for broader delineation of who qualifies as current cohabitants [13]. An inaugural attempt at posthumanist ethics consequently investigates the extent of hospitality owed toward ever-expanding, recently arrived populations, appraising human-nonhuman divides in alternative frameworks of solidarity [5]. Remarkably similar constructions of hospitality directed towards artificial or nonhuman others unfold further discourses capable of modelling an ethics of cohabitation [14]. While robotic embodiment, responsive behaviour, or lively discussion of AI merits consideration, these shared themes encountered elsewhere permit reflection on matters of language, narrative culture, and figural representation, concepts notably associated with the repertoire of cohabitation [8].

Critiques and Limitations

Central critiques of posthumanism emphasize the risk of essentializing human existence and human-nonhuman relations while undermining constructive political engagement [1]. Opponents contend that posthumanists mistakenly assume the exclusive existence of human and nonhuman beings, treat thinking as purely a human activity, and deny the material embeddedness of thoughts. Such concerns often center on the writings of Rosi Braidotti, renowned for her affinity with the life sciences [2]. Concerns have emerged regarding the political, social, and economic regulations that scholars think many posthumanists neglect to address [3]. Given that equity and justice remain foundational questions for philosophy, posthumanist approaches that overlook them may fall short. Even if nonhumans exist, the political implications of habitat destruction demand immediate consideration. Works by Nina Lykke underline the need for attention to governance issues arising from transgenesis [4]. Similarly, the "Knightian" interpretation of Donald MacKenzie argues that regulatory issues in human reproductive technologies, esoteric bioethics, and human cloning are still pertinent. Methodological critiques of posthumanism highlight its alleged vagueness and confusion about its very subject matter [5]. Critics deem texts too difficult to test, excessively broad in the range of objects treated as potentially nonhuman, and lacking an adequate articulation of the imported philosophical legacy." R. J. Delany characterizes posthumanism as at risk of becoming a mere loose baggy monster based on the extent of the ensemble [6]. Posthumanism is subject to essentialist objections. Attempts to found comprehensive responses to all objects and selected posthuman principles run the risk of falling back into epistemological anthropocentricity or unknowability in the broadest sense. Such moves do not escape humanism [7]. Evading the determination of guidelines for universalism risks sliding away from the sufficiently posthuman [1]. Such frameworks deliberately refuse to offer a positive general proposal on the grounds that ontology is daunting. Many species would still not know posthumanist premises sufficiently to endorse any principles legitimately. A sufficiently satisfying detail-laden elaboration proving beyond doubt that such matters arise remains absent [3, 13].

Risks of Essentialism and Anthropocentrism

Despite its ethical and epistemological ambitions, contemporary scholarship remains troubled by the continuity it postulates between the human and the nonhuman [3]. Rather than furthering a radical de-centering of the human, the very notion of "the posthuman" risks entrenching anthropocentrism in a new guise. Well-intentioned concern for nonhuman others may simply re-establish "Man at the centre," reframing the nonhuman as a means for expanded human flourishing [4]. The "posthuman" retains strong ties to the historical, philosophical, and social parameters that make it human. Furthermore, yielding agency and considerability to nonhuman nonlivings may bolster calls to see agency as an exclusively human property [1]. Several thinkers thus urge caution and a retreat from the term "posthuman," advocating instead an expanded understanding of "the human" that remains critical of its inherited assumptions [14].

Political and Social Implications

Posthumanism critiques prevailing human-centered frameworks and the ethical consequences they entail, argues for the expanded moral considerability of nonhuman others, and posits that the current theoretical and practical focus on humanity and the human masking the bifurcation of the human and nonhuman requires the realisation that humanity is fundamentally undermined [4]. Contemporary posthumanist thought addresses issues of governance, justice, and equity [4]. The political and social aim of contemporary posthumanism arises from acknowledgement that conventional paradigm of the human as such constitutes an epochè or limit and thus, prohibits escaping the conceptual horizon taken as an absolute [5]. A multitude of exclusions, racist, sexist, speciesist, economic, territorial continuities with colonial and other forms of domination, and emerging asymmetries that accompany the technology, now termed the Fourth Industrial Revolution, all likewise reinforce

the urgency delineated by Nutall, that humanity does not hold within possession of the privilege to think them in the first place [3]. Such conditions frame the conception and underscore the intelligence of the techniques at issue.

Methodological and Conceptual Critiques

Contemporary accounts of posthumanism come in a variety of perspectives and models, leading to foundational methodological and conceptual criticism [6]. The vagueness of the term, its equivocation with transhumanism, and its relative impotence in terms of analytical and argumentative rigor lead to a failure to grasp the nature, duration, and stakes of contemporary posthumanism [7]. “Posthumanism”, “the posthuman”, “nonhuman” and related terms can act as synonyms for human “excess” (the augmentation of the human animal by technologies like prosthetics or artificial intelligence) and the effective “recontouring” of the human future [8]. In this position, human animals, their global societies, and the biosphere simultaneously face additional dimension-altering shifts. Given the significance of philosophy’s transition from classical to post-classical or contemporary it comes as no surprise that material-semiotic considerations enter contemporary posthumanism [9]. MacKenzie notes that standard accounts of material-semiotic collectives emphasise the circulation of, for example, scientific knowledge, concepts, ideas and discourse. These circulate within culturally-specific sociotechnical frameworks of interpretation, reception and dissemination, but not the world as such [10]. Whereas philosophical and political “absence” renders a contemporary posthumanism hastily different from historical continental approaches to the inhumane does not completely prevent it from bearing noteworthy similarities [11]. The specific contours of being, the nonhuman, nonphilosophy and germinal material-semiotic terminology originate with Alfred North Whitehead, Gilbert Simondon and Martin Heidegger. Their approaches differ and are separated by vast disciplinary boundaries, yet the correspondences remain vivid and unrestricted [8].

Case Studies and Applications

A case study on artificial intelligence (AI) and moral agency exemplifies posthumanist theory in operation. Debates surrounding accountability for autonomous weapons and AI decision-making systems exemplify a prevailing anthropocentrism in AI contexts, forwarding an assumption of human agents as the only morally responsible actors [7]. While AI does not yet rise to the level of moral agency, many AI systems possess a sophisticated decision-making capacity that warrants inclusion in expansive moral frameworks [8]. A second study in environmental humanities illustrates the ontological shifts characteristic of posthumanist discourse [8]. Climate change discourse has shifted discussions of material entanglements and world-making toward modes of existence articulated by scholars such as Karen Barad and Bruno Latour [9]. Whereas phenomenological approaches to pre-Socratic thinkers investigate how humans relate to still-life objects, environmental humanities scholarship extending posthumanist themes examines how agents emerge from material relations. Humans increasingly appear not as transcendental agents but as one of many stakeholders in shared, co-constructed ecologies [10]. A third study in bioethics reflects an update of established subjectivities in light of embodied and disembodied media and the ontological instability implicated by posthumanist theory [11]. New forms of existence such as constructs, creatures generated by virtual software and lived online; necessitate the emergence of new norms regarding identity and recognition [3].

Artificial Intelligence and Moral Agency

Discussion of posthumanism increasingly parallels the rise of artificial intelligence (AI). The ongoing transformation of societal power dynamics has sparked debate not only about the authority of machines but also about the prospects for a world free from human governance [12]. These questions center on understanding the status of machines whether they are transparent tools or active agents and determining the existence and dispersion of moral agency among human collectives and large organizations [11]. Such inquiries emphasize the importance of deliberating the moral consideration, status, and rights attached to certain configurations of collective agency or AI [12]. The potential for machines to hold moral status or agency raises core questions regarding who or what might qualify for such designation, the normative expectations that accompany it, and the conditions under which moral agency might migrate from traditionally recognized categories [13]. The emergence of AI as a new channel of moral agency only reinforces the need to evaluate human interaction and interface with the broader assemblage of life in various terms [14].

Environmental Humanities and Ontological Shifts

A focal point in ecology, the environmental humanities engage in material interrogation material understood here not as inert stuff but as entangled, as a site of ‘world-making’ [3]. Posthumanism, as defined in the previous sections, resonates with these theoretical currents. Recent spikes in posthumanist interest have nourished exploration of the material entanglements between nonhuman bodies, technologies, other-than-human agents, and historical, political, and geographical factors that shape conditions of existence [4]. In the context of a climate crisis and its attendant planetary-scale catastrophes, posthumanist scholarship investigates how world-making

continues across assemblages that do not include humans and how nonhumans participate in the construction of the human [1].

Bioethics and Radically Updated Subjectivities

Emerging norms in bioethics and analytical frameworks originating in complexity science acknowledge the expansion of subjectivities radically altered by contemporary technologies [6]. Reprogramming individuals at will inspires invocations of the Islamic state, and trans-positions point to the urgency of considering life after death and asymptotic subjectivities. The onset of AI confers visibility upon individuals investing all agency in algorithms, seeking deliberative solitude in systems of intense governance [7]. Complex dynamics govern vehicles materially constituted by others, which authors describe as orifice societies. Religious events can produce total mobilization of such intricate subjects. New configurations of mind and matter, science and politics, endeavor to connect Angela Davis's social death to alternatives currently circulating [8]. The posthuman cannot be construed as a new humanism, but neither can it be described as its opposite. Contemporary philosophy interrogates agency, contemplates new configurations of conditional emancipation, and embraces the transduction of art into teaching. The aim is not to reach an indivisible atom liberated from material round-ups, but to pursue a fugitive position widely present, traversed, reached, stricken, reassembled, morphed, and shared across the social terrain yet rarely articulated, a quintessentially gathering account. Authors have drawn connections between D. H. Lawrence and Jean-Luc Nancy and various figures of solidarity alongside Michel Serres and what characterizes profound dereferencing at large, pertaining to contingent determination at least partially extracted from the political status of collectivity [10]. Posthumanism can thus be cogently defined as a gathering-fill, propagating at diverse levels and sharing across webs and areas of life widely dispersed across times and spaces, tightly linking the economic to the spatio-temporal domain and having occupied globally consequential axes [10]. Annotated reading entails, from both sides, responding to the very excesses at stake alongside their wide transmission, but also the difficulty of engaging deep thoughts in warmer regions where routes mingle consigning them to oblivion. Reconfigurations flow in multiple settings: activating, mobilizing, universes, contact zones, coordinates, assemblages designates for gathering readily multiply [11].

Methodological Reflections

Posthumanism is a fickle philosophy due to its illusive origins and multiple interpretations, with ongoing changes over time [8]. It involves the decentering of the human from traditional positions rooted in theology and philosophy. Scholarly engagement with posthumanism has enriched research in critical studies, philosophy, anthropology, and sociology, yet each discipline draws upon varying definitions and applications. The term has been appropriated by different disciplines and continues to evolve [9]. Current trends in posthumanist scholarship point to the critical examination of techno-humanism, critiques of sentio-centric approaches, exploration of human possession of non-human characteristics, and inquiries into the relations between living beings through the concept of "becoming with" [1].

Interdisciplinarity and Collaborative Inquiries

The database of academic works now includes interdisciplinary explorations and collaborative approaches alongside individual pursuits [10]. Similar posthumanism dimensions have further emerged, allowing other fields to interrogate knowledge, reconsider foundational assumptions, and articulate fresh inquiries. Aesthetic considerations mediate forms of engagement deploying artistic practices, theory, and scholarship across disciplinary boundaries [11]. The relational, sociomaterial, and ecocritical dimensions of certain texts dovetail with concerns for human and nonhuman encounters, collective practices, and institutional ecologies. Such work extends posthumanism into regions less readily characterised as posthuman and contributes to a broader, shared engagement with current philosophy, culture, and politics [12]. Posthumanism serves as a site of intellectual and cultural reflection, and much engagement remains programmatic, speculative, or open-ended. Towards examining the implications of transdisciplinary forms of posthumanism, the deployment of thought-experiments accompanies a range of future-oriented explorations, hypothetical scenarios, and speculative reasoning [13]. This practice builds upon and extends the precedent from other contemporary thinkers while avoiding simplistic or reductive engineering tropes. Preliminary benchmarks highlight the multi-faceted and multi-scalar dimensions of possible futures or alter modernities and attest to the indeterminate character of these propositions [14].

The Role of Thought Experiments and Speculative Scenarios

Posthumanism is associated with the task of examining various propositions regarding the human, humanism, anthropocentrism, and the human/animal distinction that seem plausible under present conditions [12]. Similarly, thought experiments (TEs) and speculative scenarios (SSs) involving the imagined existences of things or states of affairs that do not currently exist are common in contemporary posthumanist writings [13]. Hence, examining the role of TEs and SSs in posthumanism becomes important. Limiting the analysis to posthumanism and not the competing, related notions of posthumanity, transhumanism, or posthumanities resonates better with the wider

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited

area of philosophy concerned by thinkers such as François Laruelle, Manuel DeLanda, Patricia Pisters, and many others. Since no TEs or SSs could be found among the pioneering theorists of posthumanism, the analysis will only consider contemporary, mostly analytic propositions that are recognizably posthumanist [14].

CONCLUSION

Posthumanism has emerged as one of the most influential contemporary attempts to rethink the human in relation to animals, technologies, environments, infrastructures, and other nonhuman actors. Across continental, analytic, feminist, queer, and critical race traditions, posthumanist scholarship challenges the assumption that humanity possesses a unique ontological or moral status and instead emphasizes relationality, entanglement, and distributed agency. In doing so, it expands ethical inquiry beyond human-centered frameworks and opens new debates about artificial intelligence, ecological crisis, biotechnology, governance, and responsibility. The paper has shown, however, that posthumanism is neither conceptually uniform nor free from serious difficulties. Its vocabulary is often polysemic; its boundaries with transhumanism are frequently blurred; and some formulations risk reproducing anthropocentrism by making the “posthuman” intelligible only through inherited human categories. Critics also question whether certain posthumanist approaches adequately address concrete issues of justice, political economy, regulation, and historical inequality. These objections are especially pressing in contexts shaped by colonialism, racism, sexism, speciesism, and technologically intensified forms of exclusion. Despite these limitations, posthumanism remains valuable as a critical orientation rather than a finalized doctrine. Its strongest contribution is not the prediction of a future species beyond humanity, but the insistence that contemporary social, technical, and ecological realities cannot be understood through an isolated model of the human subject. Climate change, AI systems, global infrastructures, and multispecies ecologies reveal that agency, vulnerability, and responsibility are distributed across heterogeneous assemblages. Future work will need to clarify concepts, strengthen methodological rigor, and integrate posthumanist insights with robust accounts of justice, governance, and democratic accountability. If pursued in that direction, posthumanism can continue to serve as a productive framework for analyzing the ethical and political conditions of life in an increasingly interconnected and more-than-human world.

REFERENCES

1. Umbrello S. Posthumanism: A fickle philosophy? *Existenz*. 2018;13(1):63-74.
2. Joy E, Kłosowska A. The work, or the agency, of the nonhuman in premodern art. *J Narrat Theory*. 2016;46(2):207-236.
3. Brooks JA. *Rewriting the human: Death anxiety and posthuman vision in literature since 1945* [doctoral dissertation]. Gainesville (FL): University of Florida; 2013.
4. Umbrello S. Safe-(for whom?)-by-design: Adopting a posthumanist ethics for technology design. *NanoEthics*. 2018;12(3):307-320. doi:10.1007/s11569-018-0331-7.
5. Irvine R, Degeling C, Kerridge I. Uncanny animals: Thinking differently about ethics and the animal-human relationship. *Anim Stud J*. 2012;1(1):3-25.
6. Hawley SH. Challenges for an ontology of artificial intelligence. *Minds Mach*. 2019;29(4):563-582.
7. Nunes JA. Rescuing epistemology. *Soc Epistemol*. 2012;26(2):145-160.
8. Dare E. The upper ontology of the world. *Philos Today*. 2019;63(3):561-578.
9. Toffoletti K. Catastrophic subjects: Feminism, the posthuman, and difference. *Soc Semiot*. 2004;14(1):79-90.
10. Lambert C. *Queering identity: Becoming queer in the work of Cassils* [master's thesis]. Victoria (BC): University of Victoria; 2017.
11. Müller VC. Ethics of artificial intelligence and robotics. In: Zalta EN, editor. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Spring 2020 ed. Stanford (CA): Stanford University; 2020. Available from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2020/entries/ethics-ai/>
12. Donati P. The dream of transcending the human through the digital matrix: A relational critique. *Int Rev Sociol*. 2019;29(3):393-412.
13. Cudworth E, Hobden S. Liberation for straw dogs? Old materialism, new materialism, and the challenge of an emancipatory posthumanism. *Globalizations*. 2014;11(5):685-698. doi:10.1080/14747731.2014.957586.
14. Hojme P. *Whose survival? A critical engagement with the notion of existential risk* [master's thesis]. Lund (SE): Lund University; 2019.

CITE AS: Kato Nabirye H. (2026). Posthumanism in Contemporary Philosophy: Key Debates and Criticisms. NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW, COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGES, 6(2):82-91
<https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJLCL/2026/6.2.8291>